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Маргарите Александровне

Нас не так уж и много,
Чтоб друг друга не знать,
Чтоб на общей дороге
По шагам узнавать.

Чтобы спорить и верить,
Чтоб исказать и мечтать,
И друг другу свиданья
У костра назначать.

Чтобы общую песню
Подхватить и пропеть,
Чтоб душой полевой
Нигде не стареть.

Нас не так уж и много
Чтоб друг друга не знать,
И коллег юбилеи
Как свои отмечать . . .

To Margarita Aleksandrovnna

There are not so many of us
For us not to know each other,
So we can recognize each other
By our steps on the common road.

To debate and believe,
To search and dream,
And make dates with each other
By the bonfire.

To start singing along
A shared song,
Not to grow old
In our field soul.

There are not so many of us
For us not to know each other
And the anniversaries of colleagues
We celebrate as our own . . .

A. V. Tabarev 2007
Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography
Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences
Novosibirsk
Translator’s Introduction

This work was originally published as Маргарита Александровна Дикова: к 80-летию со дня рождения: Биобиблиографический указатель [Margarita Aleksandrovna Dikova: For Her 80th Birthday: With Bibliographic Index] through the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation—Northeastern State University. Magadan: SVGU, 2017. A number of words, particularly names, have to be brought into English from Russian. How is this done? Every translation, and particularly from Russian to English, has the problem of finding a suitable form of transliteration. None of the three systems available (U.S. Board of Geographic Names [BGN], Library of Congress [LOC], or “Linguistic” system [Ling]) was felt to be entirely adequate. I have therefore created my own system. In this I use some of the BGN system with a slightly modified version of the LOC. For example, the Russian “е” (“ye” of BGN) is written as “e,” following LOC. The Russian “ё” is also written as “e” (not as “yo”), following Ling. The Russian “ё” is written as “e,” following BGN. Both the Russian “и” and the “й” are transliterated as “i,” unlike any of the three systems. The Russian “ю” and “я” are written as “yu” and “ya” respectively, following the BGN. The Russian soft sign, which is often dropped in transliterations or replaced with an “i,” is retained here as an apostrophe, following BGN.

In this case, I transliterate the archaeologist’s name Кирьяк as “Kir’yak” rather than “Kiryak” or “Kiriyak” or even “Kirjak”—forms that can be found in the literature. I have also settled, as much as possible, on one ending for words, as the English language dictates, rather than providing the appropriate ending (masculine, feminine, neuter, plural/nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, instrumental, prepositional) that can occur in Russian. And having 24 possible grammatical endings is not the end of it. In the masculine nominative, for a name ending in “-sky” there are at least five possible endings that can be found in English (“-sky,” “-skiy,” “-skij,” “-skii,” “-ski”). In addition, there are aberrant spellings that have been accepted in the literature.

For example, Wrangel instead of the Russian Vrangel’ has already been adopted in English. Some names are “semi-formalized” in English. For names that do not have an accepted English form I have used my system above for transliterating. All this in no way exhausts the possibilities and problems the translator faces, but rather it provides a notion of the difficulties attendant upon any translation project. Why do I not pick one system or another? All three systems (BGN, LOC, and Linguistic) use diacritics, or something similar, making library searches difficult. The BGN uses an unumlauted e (ē); the Linguistic system uses a number of diacritics, such as č, š, ž, and others; and the LOC, most problematic, uses an arc between some pairs of letters, such as įs, įa, and įu. All the letters in my system are standard Roman letters that can be typed into library search engines.

I hope the explanation of my method will aid the reader, especially if he or she should want to go back from English to Cyrillic, and I hope everyone will recognize their names here even if they are different from how they would appear in their native language.

I would like to thank Anna Gokhman for reviewing the work for mistranslations, Vanessa Salvia for the editing, Brandon Hamilton for the layout, and Appligent for converting the file into a 508-compliant document. Each performed an excellent job. Finally, I am very grateful to Nan Coppock, without whom this project could not have been
done. Most of all I must thank Dr. Irina Ponkratova for permitting her biography of Margarita Aleksandrovna (Kir'yak) Dikova to be published in English.
From the Compiler

This bio-bibliographic index is dedicated to the well-known archaeologist of the northern Russian Far East—Doctor of Historical Sciences, Senior Research Associate at the N. A. Shilo Laboratory for the Interdisciplinary Study of Chukotka, Northeast Interdisciplinary Research Institute of the Far East Division of the Russian Academy of Sciences (SVKNII DVO RAN)—Margarita Aleksandrovna (Kir’yak) Dikova. In 2017, she turned 80 years old. Of those years, she devoted more than 40 to the difficult task of archaeological investigation of the north, as well as teaching schoolchildren and college students the basics of history and archaeology. When this was written she lived in Anadyr and worked as a senior research fellow at the Laboratory for the Interdisciplinary Study of Chukotka (the “Chukotka” Center) of the SVKNII DVO RAN.

It was possible to use archival documents while writing the biography of M. A. Dikova (curriculum vitae, materials of the State Archive of the Magadan Region, and documents and photographs from the family archive), data from interviews with colleagues of Margarita Aleksandrovna at the Northeastern State University (Candidate in Historical Sciences G. A. Pustovoit, and Candidate in Pedagogical Sciences Professor R. P. Korsun) and at the Magadan Regional History Museum (Deputy Director S. V. Budnikova), reminiscence of colleagues and friends, scholarly monographs, articles, and reviews of M. A. Dikova, which allowed us to evaluate her contribution to the development of archaeological science in the northern Russian Far East. And, of course, when preparing this biographical essay, Margarita Aleksandrovna herself, despite her busy schedule, always clarified certain events and answered questions.

The index herein includes the scholarly biography of M. A. Dikova, a chronological list of her scholarly papers, a list of essays and articles about her, an index of co-authors, a list of conferences and academic grants, and photographs from her personal archive.

The author expresses gratitude to colleagues at the Department of General History and History of Russia of the Northeast State University and to university graduate E. I. Mudraninets, who helped in the work on the publication.

Irina Yur’evna Ponkratova
Professor and Senior Research Associate
Northeastern State University
Magadan, Russia
ponkratova1@yandex.ru
CHAPTER 1

FORMATION OF M. A. DIKOVA AS A SCHOLAR: THE INITIAL STAGE OF HER SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

1.1. Major Milestones in the Biography before 1973

1.1.1. Childhood and Youth of Rita Korobchenko (1937–1967)

Rita Korobchenko (Margarita Aleksandrovna Kir’yak Dikova) was born on February 3, 1937, in Krasnodar to the family of a Red Army serviceman. Her father, Aleksandr Stepanovich Korobchenko, graduated from the Saratov Tank School; her mother, Maria Yakovlevna Korobchenko (née Petrenko), was a housewife. Rita’s pre-war childhood was spent in military garrisons—first in Yaroslavl, then in Naro-Fominsk, where in 1940 Margarita Aleksandrovna’s brother Alexander was born.

On the eve of the war, in May 1941, on the advice of her father’s parents, who lived in Pyatigorsk, Stavropol Province, the family moved to be with them. The city was in a state of tense anticipation of war—the child’s memory preserved drills and military training sessions in small, enclosed Pyatigorsk courtyards (Dikova 2006).

In the summer of 1942, Margarita Aleksandrovna’s mother, who had two young children with her, decided to search for her parents, who had been exiled in the 1930s during the dekulakization (repression of prosperous peasants) to the Sal’sk steppes. In the second year of the war, the German army occupied the North Caucasus, where Pyatigorsk lies near the foothills. The North Caucasus railway was crowded with trains carrying military equipment and moving toward them. The family rode in freight cars ("telyachi," as they were called, meaning to transport calves and other cattle) with frequent stops and transfers. They lived for a long time in settlements along the railroad and the terrible bombing during this time, especially in Kropotkin (Kavkazskaya Station), remained a nightmare in the memory of little Rita—the child’s constant fear when at dawn the drone of flying aircraft was heard, and then the soul-rending howl of dropping bombs. The six months she spent in the occupation zone remained a time of fear and anticipation of death. Later, she would write:

In a warm park in Berlin, in eternal peace,
My childhood was saved by a Soviet soldier,
I remember his hands singed by battle,
I fell asleep in them to the roar of cannonades.
A five-year-old child, I saw the huts,
Blazing with a smoky and greedy fire,
But I believed, knew, the soldiers would return,
With them, peace would return to my home.
Having become embodied in granite, a messenger of lasting peace,
He lowered his punishing sword to his feet.
The eternal flame is for you, the best songs are for you,
I know that you can save the peace on earth.
In February 1943 they returned to Pyatigorsk, which had been liberated from the invaders. In 1944 Margarita Aleksandrovna started school. As a first-grader she witnessed the end of the war—the most memorable and joyful day of her childhood life, remembered by everyone’s jubilation, songs, smiles, and flowers.

At the end of 1944, Margarita Aleksandrovna’s father was assigned to a military unit in the Crimea and they moved to its location near Simferopol, and then to the city itself. In 1947 her father was transferred to Germany, and her mother went with the children to her brother in Krasnodar. In 1948 her father was discharged from the army. They again began to go from city to city, but now in search of housing and work for the parents: they lived in villages in Krasnodar Province—Platnirovskaya and Krylovskaya—then returned to Pyatigorsk, where Rita graduated from the 7th grade. Finally, they stayed for two years in Cherkessk, where her parents worked in geological exploration. After the prolonged journey, during which she sometimes had to study in three different schools in a single year, Rita managed in Cherkessk to focus on her studies and finished grades 8 and 9 with excellent marks and commendations. When the question arose about her parents moving to a new place of work in the Ukraine, the school did not want to let go of her—as a promising student and candidate for the Gold Medal (Dikova 2006).

But in the academic year 1953–54, Margarita had to start and finish in a new place—in the city of Zheltye Vody [Yellow Waters] of the Dnepropetrovsk Region. At that time, this city (of a closed type) was known as “Pochtovyj yashchik 28” [Mailbox 28]. It had begun its growth near a small mining village, was built behind barbed wire, and was probably based on a standard model. At that time there were two schools in Zheltye Vody—a Ukrainian one and a recently opened Russian one, where Margarita was to study. The 10th grade was formed of other newcomers and consisted of only ten people, creating favorable conditions for a full mastery of the school curriculum by each of them. Margarita had to assert herself in the new team and work hard, realizing that this would be the last, the final, grade, and then she would have an independent life away from her parents.2

Margarita graduated from school with a Gold Medal, which gave her the right to enroll in university without entrance exams. The family’s financial situation did not allow them to dream of a long trip, so the faculty of Philology of Dnepropetrovsk University was chosen, but when she arrived to submit documents and pass an interview, it turned out that the medalists had already been accepted. Recalling the fascinating stories of geologists about field work and young female geologists with whom she had to communicate when her parents worked in exploration, Margarita decided to enroll in the Mining Institute, but she did not succeed there. And, now desperate, she tried her luck and applied to the Institute of Chemical Technology, where she was accepted to the faculty of Rubber Technology. So, at the age of 17, Rita Korobchenko’s independent life began (Dikova 2006).

Rita was a good student at the institute, though she studied there without pleasure. Most of all she loved German and “reading” blueprints (technical details) for spatial imagination—this came to her very easily, without much effort. However, she was

---

1 A “closed type” city was one within which enterprises for the development and manufacture of weapons of mass destruction and the like was “closed” to protect state secrets.

oppressed by the lack of permanent living quarters and the constant search for housing “that was cheaper,” as well as a half-starved existence, when “a pie with liver was sweeter than a piece of cake.” From that life in Dnepropetrovsk, Margarita Aleksandrovna remembered the long queues of students (among them there were many Chinese) at the food stalls with pies, and horse-meat sausages, which students sometimes could afford to buy.

This feeling of dissatisfaction ultimately led Margarita to the decision to leave for Pyatigorsk—to her father’s parents, and enter the Philology Department of the Pedagogical Institute. Then, after passing an interview and promising the admissions committee to go to work at a designated place they would assign her to after graduating,³ in September 1955, Margarita Aleksandrovna began training at the Pyatigorsk State Pedagogical Institute. She was very lucky since just that year a new program had been introduced that provided for the study of historical sciences at the Philology Department, which became known as the “Historical-Philological Department,” and the term of study was extended by one year.

Student life in the small provincial city was not much different from the capital. Among the teachers were professors who came out of the 19th century; they represented the intelligentsia, which carefully fostered the spiritual wealth of Russian culture. To the second generation of teachers who had passed through the crucible of the Second World War (among them was the Hero of the Soviet Union I. V. Korol’kov, as well as Aleksandr Ivanovich Prokhorov, the idol of the students, who had returned from the front missing both arms). The students were indebted to the humanism and sense of true patriotism inherent in that generation (Dikova 2006).

Her student life was full of bright events. The classmates put on performances by A. P. Chekhov and N. V. Gogol, gathered for grandiose city singing (at that time choral singing was popular), and went to regional festivals. Their literary evenings at the Institute were attended by famous writers and poets, including Nazym Hikmet, L. Oshanin, F. Panferov, and others. Of course, there were unpleasant moments such as work on collective farms to harvest corn (called “the queen of the fields”), weeding vineyards, and so on, but they were not devoid of positivity, since students got to know each other better, learned to appreciate friendship and a sense of community. The institute became the school that determined the life credo of the future teacher Margarita Kir’ya: “To sow the wise, the good, the eternal.”

In 1960 Margarita Aleksandrovna graduated from the institute with honors and went on assignment to the Altai. In the seven-year rural school (in the village of Glushinka in the Kosikhinskii District) she taught Russian language and history. On her first vacation (summer of 1961) she visited her parents in Zheltye Vody, where she married Pavel Vladimirovich Kir’ya, a native of that city, and did not return to the Altai. She worked for one year at a boarding school, and in 1962 she moved to the evening mining technical school, where she taught history, Russian language, and literature for four years.

The 1960s are called the time of the “khrushchevskoi ottepeli” [Khrushchev thaw], but for Margarita many things were unclear and incomprenhensible. This was the time of debunking the personality cult of Stalin, but how could one explain the obviously cult film

---

³ This was called “distribution” of young specialists.
Nash doro goi Nikita Sergeevich [Our Dear Nikita Sergeevich], released in 1964, and then
the subsequent resignation of the General Secretary. Yes, it was the time of recognition
of the novel by A. Solzhenitsyn, Odin den' Ivana Denisovicha [One Day in the Life of Ivan
Denisovich], but also the ban of the book by N. Dudintsev, Ne khlebom yedinym [Not by
Bread Alone]. But Margarita Aleksandrovna was young and not without romanticism. Her
favorite magazine in those years was Yunost' [Youth]. V. Aksenov's story "Apel'siny iz
Marokko" [Oranges from Morocco] published on its pages, and O. Kuvaev's stories about
Chukotka called her and her husband to the Far North, where a nuclear power plant was
under construction at the village of Bilibino (Dikova 2006).

Summing up the initial stage of life of the future globally renowned scholar, one
can see that her childhood occurred in the war years, her childhood memories retained
the drills, the months of occupation, and the soul-rendering howl of dropping bombs. This
had been a time of fear and anticipation of death. Nor were the school years easy. Her
father's military assignments, and then her parents' job search, required constant moving
to different cities, changing schools. Despite this, Rita had been a good student and
graduated with a Gold Medal. Her student life in the Department of History and Philology
at the Pedagogical Institute in Pyatigorsk was full of bright events: performances, literary
evenings, festivals, meetings with famous poets and writers, and education with
professors who represented the real intelligentsia. Perhaps it was then that Margarita's
literary talent was formed that would later be in demand in her scientific, social, and
teaching activities. Excellent training in the humanities and erudition received during her
studies later gave her archaeological research wide variety and complexity, as well as the
associative richness of her interpretations of archaeological sources.

1.1.2 The "Chukotka Epopee" of Margarita Kir'yak (1967–1973)

Margarita Aleksandrovna had a dream—to visit Chukotka—and she realized this
dream. She did not go to Chukotka for money, although at that time they paid a lot in the
north. She went "for the fog and the smell of the taiga," as many sang and did then. And
from 1967 her life and activities would forever be inextricably linked with this territory,
which in many respects was still a "blank spot" on the map of the country.

In 1967 Margarita Aleksandrovna, along with her husband and three-year-old
daughter, having sold all their furniture to buy tickets, first found themselves in the village
of Bilibino and then in the village of Aliskerovo. That's when Margarita Aleksandrovna first
encountered the extraordinary situation of the circumpolar region—the forest tundra,
where rushing reindeer sleds raised snow dust—and she fell in love with the north
(Gavrilova 2007: 10).

She first worked in the small mining village of Bilibino as a kindergarten teacher
and then as a history teacher. During the first year of work in the village of Aliskerovo,
Margarita Aleksandrovna organized a club of Red Pathfinders, whose members sought
out participants of the Civil War—people who had taken an active part in the formation of
Soviet power in the Far East and in Chukotka—and corresponded with them. During this
year she established herself as a very conscientious teacher, educator, and a person who

---

4 This film apparently referred to Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev.
5 Red Pathfinders are equivalent to the Boy/Girl Scouts in the United States.
knew and loved her subject and her work. Her lessons were always full of interesting material, deeply thought out, that attracted children with a variety of interesting points, local history material, and connection with literary works. In addition, Margarita Aleksandrovna took an active part in the public life of the Aliskerovo mine: "she was a propagandist, gave lectures to the population, participated in amateur performances."6

After working for a year in Chukotka, the family returned to the "mainland." But the north gave her no rest. And in 1969 they returned to the village of Aliskerovo (Dikova 2006).

Working as a teacher in Chukotka, Margarita Aleksandrovna often experienced a sense of inadequacy in school education in the small village due to the lack of visual aids, technical means, and methodological literature in the school. It was due to a considerable distance from there to cultural centers that could only be reached by plane, and where even the printed material arrived after a long delay. Under these conditions it was necessary to look for ways to revitalize the educational process, fill it with content, and expand the scope of the school program. Margarita Aleksandrovna was helped in this by the village library, which was equipped not only with the classics of Marxism-Leninism but also with the fictional and scholarly literature of writers, poets, and scientists of the Magadan region and neighboring territories of northeastern Russia. In addition to local history information for the mandatory curriculum, Margarita Aleksandrovna developed an optional course on the history of the native land and presented the children in the Pathfinder group "Poisk" [Search] the job of collecting material and then opening a school museum (Dikova 2005: 60). It wasn’t easy to open a museum. She "defended it, fought with the provincial milieu and authorities of the Bilibino District for her museum and her dignity. Only she knew how many tears were shed in the nook under the school stairs where the exhibits of her museum had been thrown” (Bobrov 2015). But the plans, thanks to the energy and determination of the school teacher, were implemented, and thus local history entered Margarita Aleksandrovna’s life.

Considering the narrowness of the local library framework, she had to turn to the holdings of the capital’s libraries and archives—unrestricted business trips and long vacations provided this opportunity. Participation in scholarly historical readings in 1972 (Moscow) made it possible to personally meet scholars from the cities of Magadan, Moscow, Leningrad, and Vladivostok, and to enter the circle of problems that faced historical science. By this time, Margarita Aleksandrovna was already familiar with the contents of the Müller collection7 in the Central State Archive of Ancient Acts, and her extracts dealt with the least publicized history of the northeast in the 18th and early 19th centuries. Margarita Aleksandrovna’s decision to pursue science gained real ground. Working in the Manuscript Department of the Lenin Library, Margarita Aleksandrovna came across letters from F. F. Matyushkin and the Decembrist V. I. Shteingel’. The theme of the Decembrists would attract her, and later she would present this topic to N. N. Dikov for her dissertation, but he would not be enthusiastic about this idea (Dikova 2005: 60)

---


7 The Müller collection or Müller portfolio is a famous treasure trove of Russian history compiled by Gerhard Müller during his exhaustive ten years of travels through remote Siberian towns in search of historical and archival documents.
(only in the 2000s would she continue the theme of the Decembrists in her work with the graduate student E. Dorogaya).

In 1973 she would move to Magadan, then again and again return to her favorite Chukotka as an archaeologist, conducting field research. In 2007 she decided to permanently move to the city of Anadyr.

1.2. The Beginning of Her Scholarly Path under the Leadership of N. N. Dikov

Margarita Aleksandrovna’s initial period of life in Magadan was marked by the introduction to archaeology. Working as the head of a school group, as well as being in the Magadan Regional Department of the All-Russian Society for the Protection of Historical and Cultural Sites, she went several times together with students to excavations in Kolyma and Kamchatka at the invitation of Tamara Mitrofanovna Dikova and Nikolai Nikolaevich Dikov. Archaeology fascinated her so much that Margarita Aleksandrovna decided to apply herself in this direction.

One day she had a chance to express her desire to get involved in archaeology. After working on the excavations at the Ushki sites, when everyone was sitting around the fire, N. N. Dikov complained that large regions of the Magadan Region were left without surveys—the Okhotsk Coast and Chukotka. A. I. Lebedintsev chose the Okhotsk coast, and Margarita timidly mentioned Chukotka, where she had lived for almost five years. N. N. Dikov was surprised by her offer, but when everyone returned to Magadan, he allowed her to go on a business trip to Chukotka. Margarita Aleksandrovna decided to explore the Bilibino District, familiar to her from teaching in Chukotka, which by that time was still a “blank spot” (Dikova 2016).

N. N. Dikov approved her plan, though he treated it with some doubt (Dikova 2006). In Bilibino, Margarita Aleksandrovna met one of the oldest geologists, S. G. Glazyrin (the Bilibino Museum now bears his name). He spoke bitterly about the fact that in the summer Yakut archaeologists came and he advised them to visit Tytyl’ Lake. They visited there, but on the way back did not even stop to see Glazyrin. So, she developed a desire to visit this lake, which became in her life and fortune her starting point in archaeology.

S. G. Glazyrin told her that there was a fishing camp on the lake from the village of Ilirnai. Margarita Aleksandrovna flew to Ilirnai, found one of the Tytyl’ fishermen who was preparing an all-terrain vehicle to go to the lake. With great difficulty she persuaded him to take her with him (as on a ship, he considered women would bring bad luck). She had to wait a month (until the beginning of November). At this time, the temperatures in Chukotka reached minus 40 degrees Celsius. There were telegrams from N. N. Dikov to Margarita Aleksandrovna to return to Magadan, as winter had already begun. She didn’t back down. It took her more than ten hours to get to the fishing hut in the all-terrain vehicle that rumbled off-road and grated on the ice. Then for another two days she spoke in a loud (screaming) voice, as if trying to shout over the roar of the all-terrain vehicle. But in the morning, she again walked on the mounds and in the blowouts (almost everything was already under the snow), collected artifacts (arrowheads, large scrapers, flakes), and was happy to show them to indifferent fishermen. This is how her first independent archaeological survey took place. The ordeal was not in vain. She returned to Magadan with the results, and most importantly, with the hope of future excavations, which she began during the next season (Dikova 2016).
During the following seasons, as a result of trips to the lakes and rafting on the rivers of western Chukotka, Margarita Aleksandrovna discovered several archaeological sites of different ages and brought the first collections to Magadan of artifacts made by the ancient inhabitants of the Arctic latitudes. N. N. Dikov’s doubt was dispelled, and she decided to seriously engage in archaeology (Dikova 2006).

In 1977 M. A. Dikova was appointed head of a special West Chukotka group of the Northeast Asian Interdisciplinary Science Expedition, and she received the necessary funds for archaeological surveys and excavations in this vast area—in the basins of the Chaun, Rauchua, and Lower Kolyma rivers, and the Middle Kolyma with its large tributaries the Omolon, Bol’shoy, and Malyi Anyui rivers (Dikov 1987: L. 2).

In 1980 Margarita Aleksandrovna went to graduate school under N. N. Dikov and at the same time returned annually to the Bilibino District for archaeological research and excavations, accumulating material for her Ph.D. thesis, “Arkheologiya Zapadnoi Chukotki, Srednego i Nizhnego Prioklyma’ i nekotorye voprosy etnogeneza yukagirov” [The Archaeology of Western Chukotka and the Middle and Lower Kolyma Region, and Some Questions on Ethnogenesis of the Yukagir], which she successfully defended in January 1990.

According to N. N. Dikov:

With inexhaustible energy and courage, Margarita Aleksandrovna conducted successful archaeological surveys (with the aid of helicopters and inflatable rubber boats) and collected significant archaeological material that allowed her to comprehensively approach the ethnic interpretation of the entire set of late Neolithic sites of Chukotka, and to identify among them with certainty the Old Yukagir. The Late Neolithic site of Rauchuvagytyn I with its unique graphic images on small pieces of slate, which she analyzed with great care, played an important role (Dikov 1987: L. 2).

The materials of the ten-year search for traces of the stone age in Chukotka formed the basis of a dissertation for the degree of Candidate of Historical Sciences (Kir’yak 1989). The general conclusion made in the dissertation about the broad Neolithic Yukagir ethnocultural layer in Western Chukotka, in its central regions, and in the basin of the Lower and Middle Kolyma allowed her to join the concept of V. N. Chernenkov and L. P. Khlobystin about the ethnic Ural substrate in the circumpolar culture and very convincingly develop this concept in relation to ancient Chukotka (Dikov 1987: L. 2–3).

According to N. N. Dikov, the ethnocultural interpretation of the Late Neolithic sites of Chukotka as Yukaghir, proposed by Margarita Aleksandrovna, went back to the ethnogenetic concept of A. P. Okladnikov, which seems quite justified and natural. The research was carried out in a broad chronological range: from the Late Neolithic to the 18th century (Dikov 1987: L. 2–3).

The results of the excavations and surveys conducted by Margarita Aleksandrovna from 1977 to 1992 were published in the monograph Arkheologiya Zapadnoi Chukotki v svyazi s yukagirskoi problemoi [The Archaeology of Western Chukotka in Connection with the Yukaghir Problem] (Kir’yak 1993), which came out at a difficult time for Russian scholarship with minimal circulation and is now a truly rare publication.
Thus it can be noted that Margarita Aleksandrovna had to enter archaeological science on her own, without special training, so her post-graduate studies were both the primary school of archaeology and the universities that prepared the basis for future scholarly research. N. N. Dikov, a man of encyclopedic knowledge and a true intellectual, created the most favorable conditions for his five graduate archaeology students, who successfully defended themselves and still continue to work according to the program he planned. In 1989, Margarita Aleksandrovna and Nikolai Nikolaevich joined their fates (Nikolai’s wife, Tamara Mitrofanovna Dikova, died in 1981) and were together until his terminal illness and subsequent death in 1996 (Dikova 2006).
CHAPTER 2
THE SCHOLARLY, ORGANIZATIONAL, EDUCATIONAL, AND PUBLIC ACTIVITIES OF M. A. DIKOVA FROM 1973 TO 2007

2.1. The Activities of M. A. Dikova in the Field of Education and Teaching

In 1973 Margarita Aleksandrovna moved with her daughter Albina to Magadan (changing her apartment in Ukraine for one in Magadan). She got a job as a social director (leader of clubs) in the House of Pioneers.\(^8\) A positive, and perhaps decisive, part in this work was the ability to independently choose the direction and subject of the groups. Of course, the history of the native land had become the main topic of groups, since Margarita Aleksandrovna always believed that “knowledge of the history of your fatherland begins with familiarity with the history of the small homeland, the native land” (Dikova 2006). This principle was laid down as the basis of her group program opened within the framework of Magadan Secondary School No. 7. On the basis of groups, she formed the school club Poisk [Search]. The Magadanskii Komsomolets newspaper became the information tribune. The ultimate goal was to create a school museum (Dikova 2016).

Archaeologist Nikolai Nikolaevich Dikov was invited to a meeting of the Archaeology Club. At the meeting with him the children became carried away by his talk on the ancient cemeteries of the Chukchi, the mysterious “winged objects,” and the mysteries of the Pegtymel’ cliffs, and they became eager to participate in an archaeological expedition. And in the summer of 1974 their dream came true. Margarita Aleksandrovna and the children spent ten days on an expedition in the Kolyma Region at the mouth of the Siberdik River (Dikova 2006).

In the same year, 1974, Margarita Aleksandrovna was invited to work in the Society for the Protection of Historical and Cultural Sites (Dikova 2006). The Magadan Regional Branch of the All-Russian Society for the Protection of Historical and Cultural Sites had been working together with the Regional Department of Culture to identify and promote historical sites since the very beginning of its formation. One of the main results of this work was the publication of collections of essays and scholarly reference literature on sites (Pamyatniki . . ., 1971; 1977; 1995; Dikova, T. M. 1974). The chairman of the Magadan Regional Branch of the All-Russian Protection Society was N. N. Dikov, while Margarita Aleksandrovna worked as executive secretary in the Society (Dikova 2016) and took an active part in the compilation of the sites and memorials of the local land.

She liked the lively work, communication with many people, and the surveys that she conducted in the areas of the country’s vast region (at that time Chukotka was part of the Magadan Oblast’, or region). Booklets and small collections of historical sites published by the society in those years quickly spread to libraries and schools, arousing interest in the milestones of the difficult history of Kolyma and Chukotka.\(^9\) During her work in the Society, Margarita Aleksandrovna collected and published materials about the grave monument to A. Kh. Aliskerov, about the monuments to the first chairman of the

---

\(^8\) House of Pioneers—a place where children formed clubs, groups, teams, etc. for additional education.

\(^9\) A certificate of honor to Margarita Aleksandrovna Kr’yak from the head of the Department of Culture of the Magadan Regional Executive Committee. 1975 (from the personal archive of M. A. Dikova).
First Gishiga District Council of Workers, Peasants, and Foreign Deputies (March–July 1918), to A. A. Kurilov, and to Midshipman F. F. Matyushkin. In addition, she traced the fate of geologist A. Kh. Aliskerov and presented information about the work of the Anyui Fair. The research of the Rauchuvagytgyn I site, which she had personally carried out, also took its place in the collection of memorable places of history and culture of northeastern Russia.

Margarita Aleksandrovna, as part of the delegation of the Magadan Regional Department, often went to meetings and congresses of the All-Russian Society for the Protection of Historical and Cultural Sites to the cities of Gorky, Tarkhany, and others, and she was engaged in the improvement of monuments to prominent people in Magadan.

For her work in the Magadan Regional Department of the All-Russian Society for the Protection of Historical and Cultural Sites in 1975, she was awarded a Certificate of Honor by the Department of Culture of the Magadan Regional Executive Committee, which specifically refers to her active participation in public work and the education of working people ("Sever . . . , 205: 5).

In 1985 Margarita Aleksandrovna was invited to the Magadan Regional Museum (MOKM) as head of the Department of History of the Pre-Revolutionary Past (Kir'yak 2005: 8). For many years and with great pleasure she worked in the museum, combining this work and her “service to science” in the N. A. Shilo Laboratory of the SVKNII DVO RAN. In the museum Margarita Aleksandrovna organized exhibitions, expositions, and represented the museum on Magadan television. In the museum, they cheerfully and fervently celebrated her birthdays. But the main thing that attracted her to the museum was the possibility of organizing archaeological expeditions, which the museum’s management, represented by S. G. Bekarevich, always financed. Perhaps in this regard, the main array of archaeological collections collected by Margarita Aleksandrovna is stored in this museum. And, of course, the main goal of her research was still the same ancient history of Chukotka.

She carried out the largest works in the Bilibino District. In parallel, the territories that were located nearby (the Chaun, Anadyr, lul’tin, and North Even districts) were also studied. Many years of excavations and surveys were conducted on lakes Tytyl’ and Rauchuvagytgyn. Today, thousands of artifacts collected by M. A. Dikova are stored in the MOKM vaults, as well as in the museums of Bilibino, Anadyr, and lul’tin (those regional centers where the investigations were conducted) (Kir’yak 2005: 8). Unique artifacts discovered and described by her are presented at exhibitions. Thus today at the exhibition “Mir kamnya” [World of Stone] in the MOKM, the finds discovered by her during the archaeological study of Lake Tytyl’ are on display (Budnikova 2016).

The 1960s and 1980s were a time of fairly fruitful cooperation between scientific institutions and educational institutions. Students of history under the guidance of T. M. Dikova and N. N. Dikov became archaeological interns (Ponkratova 2010: 172–174). N. N. Dikov was a permanent co-author and reviewer of educational manuals prepared by the Department of History of the Magadan State Pedagogical Institute (MSPI). And in 1980 Margarita Aleksandrovna, taking into account her scientific and pedagogical experience, was invited to give lectures to students of MSPI (Dikova 2006).

Margarita Aleksandrovna developed her own author’s course in such disciplines as “Local History” and the “Elective Course on the History of the Native Land at School.”
Her lectures were fascinating and interesting to students who took notes, following her word for word. This was “real, live material” that had been tested in schools and could be useful to every teacher involved in local history work.

But, due to a number of circumstances related to the heavy workload at the two main jobs and the illness of her granddaughter, she had to leave teaching for a while.

In 2003 Margarita Aleksandrovna returned to the university, but as a professor with a huge amount of knowledge to pass on to her students.

During the years from 2003 to 2007, she taught a number of courses on the history of Northeast Asia at Northeastern State University. She also directed two theses: one on a topic directly related to her research on the Paleolithic of the northern Russian Far East (by I. Lyashik) and one on a topic that had long interested her, about the Decembrists (by E. Dorogaya). These were successfully defended under her leadership.

In addition to teaching, Margarita Aleksandrovna actively engaged in educational and methodological work, took part in the preparation of a book—“History of the Native Land”—for reading in primary school, which was reissued three times (Tseplyaeva 1998: 6–7, 14–16; 1998a: 6–8, 17–20; 2002: 6–8, 17–20). Her scientific materials were used in the preparation of school textbooks on the history of the native land (Korsun 2016).

Teachers who worked with Margarita Aleksandrovna noted her high level of professionalism in lectures, thorough preparation for classes, readiness to always join any type of educational and teaching activities, and to help in the preparation of student conferences and publications. Her basic principles of working with students was to not be indifferent to their problems and the desire to always help and teach (Pustovoit 2016; Korsun 2016).

She herself had always enjoyed working with students. Margarita Aleksandrovna believed that “communication with students gives confidence in the demand for human and scholarly potential.” And she was grateful to fate for this (Dikova 2006).

2.2. The Scholarly and Organizational Activities of M. A. Dikova

In 1980 Margarita Aleksandrovna began her work in the N. A. Shilo Laboratory of History, Archaeology, and Ethnography of the SVKNII DVO RAN, headed by N. N. Dikov. For exactly thirty-seven years of her life, she faithfully worked here for the benefit of science. Over the years, hundreds of sites in Chukotka were discovered and studied, four monographs, and dozens of scholarly articles were written.

The pace of the work is shown by the data in her annual reports (GAMO: L. 2, 13).

For example, on January 10, 1990, she defended her dissertation for the degree of Candidate in Historical Sciences; in April she took part in the All-Union Science Conference on Rock Art (Moscow); from June to August she carried out archaeological research in Northern and Western Chukotka, during which the sites of Bol’shoi El’gakhchan I and Rauchuvagytyyn I were studied; in August she took part in the VII Inuit Conference in Fairbanks (Alaska, USA); and in September–October she worked, following the plan of the head of SVAKAE N. N. Dikov, at the Ushki I site in the Ust’-Kamchatsk Region (Kamchatka Peninsula). In addition, one monograph, abstracts for conferences, and an article for the journal Nature were prepared for publication, and a field report for 1989 was written for the Field Research Department of the Institute of Archaeology (Moscow) (Otchet . . . , 1990).
In 1994 the main efforts of the senior researcher of the Laboratory of the SVKNII DVO RAN, M. A. Dikova,\textsuperscript{10} were aimed at preparing and participating in two international conferences in Vladivostok (in March and in August–September), as well as field work conducted in the North–Even District as from June 1 to July 20. Excavations at the site of Bol'shoi El’gakhchan I were completed and detailed surveys of the sites of Bol’shoi El’gakhchan II through IV were carried out. From July 30 to August 20, field work was conducted in the Iul’tin District of the Chukotka Autonomous Okrug (ChAO), which resulted in identification of the diachronic archaeological site Ust’-Tadlevaam. In addition, literature studies were pursued on the topic of her doctoral dissertation, and articles were prepared for the \textit{Bulletin of the DVO RAN} and for the collected works on the results of the international conference (\textit{Otchet . . .}, 1994).

After the death of N. N. Dikov in 1996, and understanding the importance of continuing research in Kamchatka, Margarita Aleksandrovna took up excavation at the Ushki sites. In 1995, at the Ushki V site, she found a complex of stone implements in cultural Layer VI (Dikova 2002: 331). In 2000 under her leadership, as part of a joint Russian-American expedition, the study of the Ushki V site was continued to determine the geological and stratigraphic conditions of the Paleolithic layers, establish their age, and collect stone artifacts through test excavations (Goebel et al. 2003: 501–505). As a result of the joint work in 2000, new information was obtained about the Ushki V site, which, however, did not solve a number of problems related to the dates of the diachronic site and questions about the ways and time of settlement of the American continent (Dikova 2002). Margarita Aleksandrovna, despite the fact that her main scientific topic continued to be the Stone Age of Chukotka, still summarized and systematized all the data on the Ushki sites (2002a: 23–25; 2002b: 315–320).

In 2003–04, under M. A. Dikova’s leadership, an archaeological survey was conducted on sites of projected industrial work in the study of the Kupol Gold Field (the border of the Bilibino and Anadyr districts of the ChAO).

In 2007, after celebrating her seventieth birthday, Margarita Aleksandrovna left for Anadyr. She set off, not for a well-deserved rest, but rather to be closer to her children and grandchildren, and, of course, to head the Laboratory of the Chukotka Branch of the SVKNII DVO RAN, and to continue her research in her beloved Chukotka.

\textsuperscript{10} Nikolai Nikolaevich Dikov, the “grand old man” of Russian archaeology in the Extreme Northeast of the Soviet Union was married to Tamara Mitrofanovna Dikova. Tamara Dikova passed away in 1981. Subsequently, Margarita Aleksandrovna Kir’yak married N. N. Dikov, becoming, of course, Margarita Aleksandrovna Dikova.
CHAPTER 3

SCHOLARLY HERITAGE OF M. A. DIKOVA

3.1 The Stone Age of Chukotka in the Works of M. A. Dikova

The results of diligent work, behind which were the difficulties of an often-dangerous field life, testing of scientific ideas in the form of presentations at conferences and publications in scholarly collections, and the painstaking preparation of annual reports to the Department of Field Research of the IA RAN has become the scholarly legacy of M. A. Dikova. This heritage can be divided into two major themes—the history of the Stone Age of Chukotka and the ancient art of the Stone Age the Northern Far East.

In 1967 Margarita Aleksandrovna Dikova was “called on the road” by Chukotka (Dikova 2006). And it was Chukotka that became a favorite place to work, and the Stone Age of Chukotka became the subject of major scholarly research.

Margarita Aleksandrovna devoted more than fifty years of her life to the Stone Age of Chukotka.

Over the years, she traveled thousands of kilometers across the tundra and along rivers in search of traces of the ancient inhabitants, discovered more than one hundred sites, and published about fifty scholarly articles and two monographs.

The first scholarly article, dedicated to Mesolithic and Neolithic sites discovered by Margarita Aleksandrovna in Western Chukotka on Tytul' Lake on the upper reaches of the Malyi Anyui, was published in 1979 (Kir' yak 1979: 39–52).

The results of surveys and excavations conducted before 1992 were summarized by M. A. Dikova in her monograph Arkheologiya Zapadnoi Chukotki v svyazi s yugagirskoi problemoi [Archaeology of Western Chukotka in Connection with the Yukaghir Problem]. The monograph introduced into scholarly circulation the latest, at that time, archaeological data obtained by the author in Western Chukotka and adjacent territories. It presented a periodization of the ancient cultures of this region from the Upper Paleolithic to the surviving Neolithic, corresponding to the Iron Age in the neighboring territories. Late Neolithic materials of Western Chukotka, along with ancient graffiti discovered here for the first time, were used for ethno genetic reconstructions. This work has brought about adjustments to corresponding ideas regarding the formation and development of ancient cultures in Northeast Asia and touched on acute issues of that discussion, including the problems of the origin of the Yukaghir (Kir' yak 1993).

This monograph does not include the materials of many open sites, such as Orlovka II, Sredne Lake V (Bilibino District), Lake Glubokoe, Lake Rechnoe, and Vakarevskaya (Anadyr District). In subsequent years new sites were discovered, such as Tytul' IV Locus 3 (Bilibino District), Umyveem (Anadyr District), Kymneiveem, Il'irnei, Ekityki, Tadlevaam (lul'tin District) Kir' yak 2005: 7). Materials from these sites appeared in various publications in subsequent years.

An article about the Paleolithic complex from the Orlovka II site was published in the SVKNII DVO RAN anthology of 1985 (Kir' yak 1985: 12–23) and reissued with new materials in 1995 in Korea (1995: 428–445). The Orlovka complex was not included in the schema of periodization of the Stone Age in Western Chukotka (1993), since Margarita Aleksandrovna hoped to resume excavations of this site, which never
happened. Orlovka II, according to the technological and morphological characteristics of the stone inventory, remains today one of the earliest Paleolithic sites in Chukotka.

In the interests of more complete coverage of the primitive history of the Northern Far East, in 2005 Margarita Aleksandrovna summarized all unpublished data that had been acquired over the previous ten to twelve years in the monograph *Kamennyj vek Chukotki (novye materialy)* [The Stone Age of Chukotka (New Materials)] (Kir’yak 2005). The purpose of the monograph was to introduce into science the entire diachronic reservoir of artifacts from the discovered archaeological sites of Chukotka for extended access by researchers.

The monograph describes the history of archaeological research of the region under study and highlights problems raised by previous researchers that were left unsolved. It is noteworthy that part of the history of research in the territory is the activity of the author herself, who under difficult conditions—for example, rafting on rivers in a rubber boat—discovered dozens of archaeological sites in remote areas.

The monograph describes the unique site at Tytyl’ Lake in the valley of the Tytyl’vaam River, gives the characteristics of each site and the artifacts found on them, and provides analogies to them in neighboring areas. In addition, an idea is given about the most unique phenomenon in archaeology—the caches of the ancient hunters discovered by both the author and her predecessors.

The monograph describes the complex of stone implements from the Srednee Lake V site, the archaeological sites in the region of the Kupol Gold Field, provides a history and description of the artifacts from Lake El’gygytgyn, and describes the archaeological sites of the Chaun District. In each case, before describing the archaeological material, Margarita Aleksandrovna gives the physical and geographical characteristics, the geomorphological structure, the history of the investigated site, and analogies with the archaeological complexes of nearby sites, as well as sites in adjacent territories, which gives special importance to the work.

The second chapter of the monograph is devoted to the periodization of the Stone Age of Western Chukotka—it defines the Orlovka II site within the chronological context of cultural complexes of Western Chukotka, and it also contains a periodization of the early Holocene cultures of Western Chukotka. The Orlovka II site is unique in its technological and morphological characteristics and is, according to M. A. Dikova, the oldest Paleolithic site in the area under study. Therefore, information about the Orlovka II site is extremely important for solving a number of problems related to the settlement of both Chukotka and the American continent.

When creating the periodization of Western Chukotka, M. A. Dikova identified a number of new stages that were not included in the previous schema of the Stone Age of Western Chukotka. These were the Upper Paleolithic and the early and late Mesolithic, and the corresponding criteria for each of the stages were defined.

In addition, Margarita Aleksandrovna described the archaeological complexes of territories adjacent to the area of her research. She provided information about those sites that are located outside Western Chukotka but are directly related to the research area since they are situated nearby. In addition to the description of archaeological sites, the author provides valuable ethnographic observations made during the course of trips to Chukchi camps.
The fourth chapter, “Ethnic Identification of Late Neolithic Complexes in Western Chukotka,” examines a vast array of sources. On the basis of these an important conclusion is drawn about isolating an ethnic community at the boundary of the 3rd and 2nd millennia BC in the area of the Middle Lena that quickly progressed to the east and by the first half of the 2nd millennium BC had reached the Kolyma, displacing the indigenous Paleo-Asiatic community. And in the first half of the 1st millennium BC one part of the bearers of the Ymyyakhtakh culture came into contact with the Paleo-Eskimo stratum and became involved in the formation of the Old Bering Sea culture, while the other part went to the American continent.

In general, it should be noted that, thanks to many years of research by M. A. Dikova and her published materials, the ancient history of Chukotka today ceases to be a “blank spot” on the map of our country.

3.2. Stone Age Art in the Northern Russian Far East in the Works of M. A. Dikova

The study of ancient art is a difficult and often thankless task. Seeing a sculpture in a seemingly simple stone, “reading” the sparing lines of “stone documents,” understanding what the ancient artist wanted to depict is not given to every researcher. And to do this, one must have not only an artistic gift but also a certain courage to convey to the scholarly community the ancient stories one has uncovered. Margarita Aleksandrovna Dikova became one of those researchers who was not afraid and tried to decipher for us the mysterious world of art of northern peoples (Dikova 2009: 208–212; 2010: 14–16; 2010a: 220–224; 2010b: 38–49; 2011: 88–100; Kir’yak 2000; 2002; 2003; 2007: 5–21; 2009; 2012). She has published about 45 scholarly articles and two monographs on this topic.

One can rightfully consider Margarita Aleksandrovna’s monograph Drevnee iskusstvo Severa Dal’nego Vostoka kak istoricheskii istochnik (kamennyi vek) [Ancient Art of the Northern Far East as a Historical Source (The Stone Age)] as a collection of fine art sites of the peoples of the Northern Russian Far East (Kir’yak 2000). Here the materials obtained by the author herself as a result of long-term work in Chukotka, as well as by researchers of the region, are involved in the analysis. This is the first work that examines the art of the peoples of the Northern Russian Far East over a wide chronological range—from the Paleolithic to the Paleometal. The monograph describes and interprets small-form stone sculptures, miniature graffiti on stone, and the Pegymel’ petroglyphs, and offers new approaches to dating them. The repertoire of small-form sculptures includes anthropomorphic and zoomorphic images and figurines of a symbolic nature. Quite rightly, in our opinion, the conclusion is made that the basis for creating anthropomorphic sculptures is “fetishization by primitive people of objects with an anthropomorphic form in the natural landscape” (Kir’yak 2003: 253).

The author reveals the tradition of making “stone heads” at the sites of Siberidik (upper Kolyma), Lopatka III (southern Kamchatka), and Tokareva (northwestern Priokhot’e), which, according to the author, are based on cultural borrowings from Pacific regions.

According to the author, animals such as mammoths, whales, seals, reindeer, and other animals that served as the object of human hunting occupied a special place as a
zoomorphic theme in the art of the ancient people of the north, and became the object of sculptural and graphic images. At the same time, the dominant position in the Paleolithic art of the northern Far East was occupied by the mammoth, while in Neolithic complexes the bear is represented in a large number of images. In addition, in the collection of stone sculptures of the northern peoples there are figures of birds and fish, which the author considers zoomorphic classifiers of the upper and lower cosmic zones. Among the ornithomorphic characters are images of an eagle-owl, goose, partridge, etc. The author divides the collection of stone fish into two groups that differ in technique and time of manufacture. Minimally processed items made from flakes were found in the Upper Paleolithic sites of Ul'khum I and Ushki I, as well as carefully retouched sculptures at the Late Neolithic sites of Western Chukotka and Kamchatka. M. A. (Kir'yak) Dikova finds analogies to zoomorphic stone products both in adjacent territories (Amur Region, Primor'e, Eastern Siberia, and the Northwest Coast of the USA), and in very remote territories (the Vologda Oblast).

In the collection of small sculptures the author also sees cosmic symbols in the form of astral and lunar figures—evidence of the observations of the visible cosmos by ancient people. Described are what is believed to be a deer head with a crescent, crescents, an asterisk figurine, and female and male symbols.

Noteworthy is the technical characteristic of stone sculpture given in the monograph, where, based on an analysis of the raw materials used by ancient masters in different periods of the Stone Age, it is correctly noted that sculpture from the Upper Paleolithic and Mesolithic sites was made mainly of coarse and naturally colored stones (sandstones, slate slabs, etc.), whereas in the manufacture of figures in the Neolithic a wide variety of stone types were commonly used—obsidian, chalcedony, jasper, flint, hornfels (Kir'yak 2003: 81–85).

A characteristic feature of Neolithic sculpture is the thorough detailing of the subject and the selection of colors of the stone substrate that convey nuances of the depicted figure. The idea is noteworthy that the use of red and yellow stone raw materials in the manufacture of pendants in the Tokarev culture of the Paleometal era could be associated with imitation of metal samples (copper, bronze, iron), which appeared sporadically in northern Priokhot' (Kir'yak 2003: 84).

Very interesting is the chapter on the role of sculpture of small form in the religious and ritual practice of the peoples of northern Eurasia, where mammoth, bear, whale, killer whale, and small marine animals—seal, lahtak, etc.—were of particular importance.

The most difficult and least solvable problem is to clarify the semantics and functional purpose of sculpted images. The author, analyzing the materials, correctly noted that the attention of a person in the Paleolithic was mainly focused on the image of the mammoth. Two more characters appeared in the Mesolithic (a bison and a bear), and in the Neolithic the image of a person (woman) and representatives of fauna (land and marine mammals, fish, birds, a newt) occupied a significant place. Stone figures were widely used during festive ceremonies and ritual activities and had sacred meaning. Some of them, in particular figures made of obsidian, could have reflected representations associated with the natural elements, for example, with thunder. The presence of astral symbols in the collection makes it possible for the author to assume the presence of sun worship among the peoples of the Northern Far East.
In general, according to M. A. (Kir’yak) Dikova, the system of images of ancient stone sculptures represents the spectrum of material and spiritual values of ancient society, in which the real existence, cult and ritual practice, myths, and “seeds of future scientific knowledge” are focused (Kir’yak 2003: 253).

The second part of the monograph is devoted to figures on stone. The graphic art of Northeast Asian tribes, according to the author, reconstructs certain aspects of the spiritual and material life of primitive society, reflects a certain stage in people’s knowledge of the surrounding world, and demonstrates the ability of their consciousness to abstract and create universal conceptions of a worldview (Kir’yak 2003: 161–232). The sources described in this part are presented in a broad chronological range. The most ancient are the engravings of Upper Paleolithic Layer VI of the Ushki I site, and the Upper Paleolithic site of Bol’shoi El’gakhchan II. A representative series of engravings on stone occurs in the Tokarev culture of the Paleometal period. The main block of graffiti was discovered by M. A. Dikova at the Late Neolithic site of Rauchuvagytgyn I, which dates to 2500 years ago (Kir’yak 2003: 168).

Taking into account the layout of individual elements and the character of the symbols, Margarita Aleksandrovna identifies several groups of figures. These are complex compositions in an oval, graffiti with a multi-tiered double zigzag, graffiti with elements of residential structures, graffiti with zoomorphic images, graffiti with a complex plot pattern, and compositions of simple geometric shapes. Based on the graphic resolution, content, and semantics of visual sources, the graffiti complex is divided into four thematic groups, whose plots embody cosmological ideas, phallic symbolism, trees, and mushrooms. Her thematic interpretation was based only on full-size images and reliably identifiable fragments. The parallels in the world’s traditional cultures revealed both general patterns of graphic art and regional features.

The third part of the monograph contains the history of the discovery and study of the Pegtymel’ petroglyphs, their description, the question of their dating, and the place of petroglyphs in the rock art of northern Eurasia. The author rightly believes that this source represents two storylines, one of which tells the story of human life in the harsh conditions of Arctic latitudes, while the second reveals an unreal world represented by myomorphic figures who appeared before the viewer in ritual actions.

It is impossible not to agree with the author’s conclusion, “that the development of ancient art in the most severe natural and geographical areas of the Far North followed the same paths that were characteristic for the entire world of art of the Stone Age,” and “formed on the basis of the hunting trade, economic, and spiritual needs of primitive society, the fine art of Northeast Asian tribes reflected all facets of their existence” (Kir’yak 2003: 255).

The fact that the monograph Ancient Art of the Northern Far East as a Historical Source (The Stone Age) is of great interest to science is indicated by the fact that it was republished in Russia (Kir’yak 2003) and then in 2009 in the United States (Kir’yak 2009).

Relatively recently, Margarita Aleksandrovna published a new monograph, The Mysterious World of Ancient Graffiti: Based on Materials from the Late Neolithic Site of Rauchuvagytgyn I (Chukotka) (Kir’yak 2012). The analyzed material was collected by the author over several years and amounted to seventy items on stone and baleen. The material is dated to 2500+100 BP (MAG-902).

M. A. Dikova opened more than 200 m² in the area of the Rauchuvagytgyn I site, where four round surface-type dwellings with closed hearths were revealed. The complex
of cultural remains consisted of household inventory, blanks of tools and items of art, stone processing waste, and fragments of ceramics. Stone, bone, horn, and baleen predominated as raw materials. The typical inventory is represented by arrowheads, burins, knives, scrapers, etc. Reindeer hunting remained the leading industry of the economy. Comparative typological analysis of the inventory allowed the author to attribute the Rauchuvagtyn I complex to the Ymyyakhtakh culture “as its local variant in the final stage” (Dikova 2012: 24–30).

Graphic miniatures made up a special set of finds at the site, the main content of the monograph being devoted to their description. Their analysis revealed such characteristic features as drawing technique (all images are scratched, grooved lines of different thickness), uniform style (images are made in a linear-geometric form), and miniature size of graffiti (10–11 cm).

The author, reflecting on the semantic load of the Rauchuvan drawings, identified several categories of them, taking into account their functional orientation. These were ritual drawings associated with certain magical actions, drawings that served as pictographic writing and contained information for tribesmen, and drawings that reflected worldviews and cosmogonic or cosmological representations. Margarita Aleksandrovna does not exclude the existence of a category for guardians, talismans that were worn as amulets. In the graphics on stone, M. A. Dikova sees the materialization of ideas of the ancient northern peoples about the surrounding world, natural phenomena, and the reflection of various beliefs and cults.

Summing up, it should be noted that all of Margarita Aleksandrovna’s studies are particularly specific due to the use of images of ethnographic materials published by famous scholars—W. I. Johelson, V. V. Antropova, I. S. Vdovin, I. S. Gurvich, W. G. Bogoras, and so on. In each of her works, broad parallels are drawn between the plot motifs of the works of northern artists, both with the regions neighboring the area under study—the Southern Russian Far East, Siberia, Yakutia, and the Northwest coast of America—and with the famous world art sites of Guatemala, Algeria, the Eastern Pamirs, Tibet, and so forth.

Margarita Aleksandrovna also has opponents among researchers of the region who deny some of her ideas and do not want to see works of art in stone substrates. But more often the arguments of opponents are reduced to simple denial, not supported by any reliable facts or convincing arguments. Fortunately, there are many more supporters of M. A. Kir’yak (Dikova)’s ideas (Ponkratova 2013: 202–208).

Newspapers and magazines write about her discoveries related to the art of the peoples of the north (Kalinin 2002; “Na Chukotke . . . ,” 2014). Her outstanding talent is attested by the reviews of doctors of historical sciences V. E. Larichev (2002), A. V. Tabarev (2001: 103–104), and others, in which it is noted that a researcher of ancient art should be able to penetrate the world of sacred (deep, hidden, behind the scenes) content of an art object, have a broad scientific outlook, and freely perceive and evaluate materials from branches of knowledge adjacent to archaeology. All this, of course, is possessed by the researcher of the ancient art of the peoples of the Northern Far East of Russia—Margarita Aleksandrovna (Kir’yak) Dikova.

Thus it can be stated that in developing the theme of ancient art of the Northern Russian Far East, Margarita Aleksandrovna was the first to fully and exhaustively present sources and materials on the art of small form of the vast region—the entire Northern
Russian Far East—that were published at different times and in hard-to-access publications; second, the objects of art that she gathered together were described in detail, chronologically subdivided, compared, and identified in terms of their connection with certain cultures; third, the main source base of her research was the collection of small forms of art personally collected by M. A. Dikova during her expeditions and reconnaissance in Chukotka—a region of extremely harsh climatic and geographical conditions; fourth, she carried out a comparative analysis of northern materials with artworks identified in Primor'e, the Amur Region, and Kamchatka, i.e., within the borders of the northeast of the European part of Russia, as well as abroad—in Alaska, Mesoamerica, and Mongolia; fifth, the objects of art of small form were analyzed, not from one culture and one chronological stage, but from a broad historical period, from the Paleolithic to the Paleometal; sixth, in her studies M. A. Dikova focused on art objects reflecting the intellectual and spiritual aspects of life of the indigenous population of the Northern Far East, the evolution of their art, the style of images, and the stability of a number of traditions.

M. A. Dikova devoted special attention to issues related to the technology of manufacturing art objects of small form and their typological classification—she described the raw materials from which small sculptures were made, the technology of their manufacture (retouching, shaping, trimming, removal of flakes, marking, etc.). A typology of figures was developed (zoological and anthropomorphic samples, symbolic images that allow different interpretations, and especially complex ones that are not amenable to image identification).

The research of M. A. (Kir’yak) Dikova on the ancient art of the peoples of the Northern Far East is obviously a striking phenomenon in the archaeology of not only their region but also of special value for the neighboring territories of Russia and the whole world.
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IN PLACE OF AN AFTERWORD

My acquaintance with Margarita Aleksandrovna Dikova took place in the 1980s when she taught such disciplines as “Local History” and an “Elective Course on the History of the Homeland at School” (then at the Magadan State Pedagogical Institute). Honestly, in my student years I did not outline lectures on every subject. But with Margarita Aleksandrovna I wrote down everything word for word—she spoke interestingly and to the point. It was “real, lively” material that had been tested in schools. I still remember my yellow school notebooks with notes from the classes and extracurricular activities in local history, which I kept for a long time.

At that time, Margarita Aleksandrovna was a member of the Site Protection Society and told us about her work: about collecting documents, materials, and photographs of sites of the Magadan Region. Today we know that the book *Sites. Memorable Places of History and Culture of Northeastern Russia*, published in Magadan in 1995, was the result of that work. I even volunteered to help her and brought from my village a photograph of the monument to Tatyana Malandina.

And it was also the time when Margarita Aleksandrovna went on her famous rafting trips on the Omolon River. Much was written about her in the newspapers, she was invited on television where she talked about her surveys (we, as students of the Moscow State Pedagogical Institute, were then invited to the studio to meet with the scholar).

Margarita Aleksandrovna was a reviewer of my thesis, and there were a lot of good comments in it. Communication with her did not end with the review of my thesis. I came to her to discuss materials related to the pottery of the peoples of the northern Russian Far East while working on my dissertation. And the idea of cooperation was born! Knowing that I wanted to study ceramics using the various methods that were available to me, Margarita Aleksandrovna eagerly showed me collections from Chukotkan sites (including from Tytyl' Lake). We selected ceramics for description and analysis, and published a joint article. The materials from her expeditions were included in my dissertation, and I am proud of it.

Immediately after I defended my dissertation, she invited me into the field with her in Kamchatka. It was the year 2000, a Russian-American expedition. There were few of us, but under her leadership we did a lot. A large excavation site, samples for analysis, and a huge number of organizational issues related to foreigners—registration for entry-exit, meetings, seeing off, permission to export samples, and much more . . . . A few years after this field season she would ask me to continue work at the Ushki sites, since much had been done but many questions had not yet been answered. This “transfer of the sites” was a sign of great confidence on her part. It’s a huge responsibility to work at the Ushki sites—in world-famous sites around which there have been many years of debate—so I did not decide immediately. And if it were not for the request of Margarita Aleksandrovna, I would hardly have taken up work at this site.

Our communication continued beyond the scope of scientific events. When she lived in Magadan, we constantly phoned each other. She shared her feelings when preparing her doctoral dissertation and monographs. How difficult it was to master the computer (they had just appeared, and she was able to acquire her first computer only after the expedition of 2000), but she did, because it had to be done. Her doctorate lay
ahead and years of accumulated materials had to be dealt with and organized in order to make them available to everyone.

I often visited her home—we drank tea with sweets and discussed various issues. Once I had to bring to her home the sad news of the death of her grandson (no one wanted to tell her about it, so they asked me). And here I cannot help but speak of her inner strength—she was a very strong person who had experienced a lot of grief (before that her granddaughter had died in her arms). Having spent a lot of time with her in the field, at conferences, in informal communication, I know how much she had to go through. Another in her place would long ago have “withdrawn into herself,” or become embittered at the whole world, but she, like the Phoenix, was reborn each time with renewed vigor. Also, she could and did forgive people—this was a very important quality! Not everyone has that ability. Only a strong person can appreciate and understand the actions (or misdeeds) of another.

Margarita Aleksandrovna also wrote poetry. A few years ago, she was awarded a diploma and a prize for her For Lyrics in Poetry at the Yu. Rytikheu Literary Competition. Sometimes she herself read poetry, with great expression, published poems in magazines, and always in her lines of poetry there was a sense of sincerity, insight, and soulfulness.

Her principles were that she could not stand lies and hypocrisy. In science, in life, she often made some people “uncomfortable” since she did not put up with it.

In the 2000s she returned to our university. It was a wonderful time! Margarita Aleksandrovna was always ready to work with students. My requests for her to speak at a student conference, to lead a science section, to help the students with publications—even when she was busy, she always found time for this. Vanya Lyashik and Lena Dorogaya—the students over whom she took “scientific patronage”—practically became her children. Not indifferent to the problems of students, and hence always wanting to help, to instruct, was probably her main principle as a teacher. And as a result of this, lectures, seminars, and consultations were always prepared at a professional level. I know that already as a doctor of historical sciences she carefully developed each of her classes. One does not always find such an attitude toward students among doctors of sciences.

In her last days Margarita Aleksandrovna lived in Anadyr. We corresponded, called each other. Even being far away, she managed to help me. And here one more important quality of this person should be noted—kindness! She really liked helping people, giving gifts. She always said that she enjoyed it. As a memento of her, I have a miniature handmade metal vase.

This person became for me a real teacher both in science and in life.

Irina Yu. Ponkratova
Magadan
November 20, 2016
Photo 1. Little one-year-old Rita. 1938.

Photo 4. 8th grade, 1951-52 school year.
Photo 5. Krasnodar garden, Zheltaya River, autumn, 10th grade.

Photo 6. Ukraine, holidays, after the first year of Pyatigorsk State Pedagogical Institute. 1956.
Photo 12. Pyatigorsk, third year of Pyatigorsk State Pedagogical Institute. At the “Dedy” Fountain.
Photo 15. Meeting with Nazim Hikmet (Turkish poet exiled from his homeland) and Lev Oshanin. 1960.
Photo 18. Rita in Chukotka for the first time. 1967.
Photo 31. Rauchuvagytgyn I site with a guest from the tundra. 1981.
Photo 34. End of August, Rauchuvagytyn site, Chukotka. 1987.
Photo 37. In the melting snow. Early July on the upper reaches of the Omolon (V. M. Rezinovskii, M. A. Dikova, L. Khakhovskaya, V. Sharshakov, I. Vorobei. 1988.)
Photo 41. In front of the raft on the Anguema River with S. G. Prostakov and young helpers. 1994.

Photo 49. Vladivostok. After defense of her doctoral dissertation.

Photo 52. With Fumiko Ikawa Smith in the village of Esso (Kamchatka Peninsula) during the conference “Following the Traces of Ancient Campfires . . . .” September 2005.
Photo 53. With Ted Goebel (USA) and Irina Yu. Ponkratova at the opening of the memorial plaque of N. N. Dikov during the conference “Following the Traces of Ancient Campfires . . .” September 2005.